

## REMARKS

Claims 1-19 have been rejected. By this Amendment, claims 10 and 19 has been amended. Thus, claims 1-19 remain pending. Applicant requests reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

### Claim Rejection Under 35 USC §101

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Examiner contends that the information browser program of claim 19 is neither stored on a computer-readable medium, nor does it fall within the protected subject matter under 35 U.S.C 101.

Claim 19 has been amended to recite, “an information browser program product comprising *a computer-readable medium* containing computer-readable instructions.” Thus, Applicant submits that claim 19, as amended, recites statutory subject matter and requests that the rejection on these grounds be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Beranek et al. (UK Patent Application GB 2329309, published March 17, 1999).

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP § 2131. Applicant submits that Beranek does not teach the subject matter of independent claims 1, 10 and 19.

Beranek describes, “a discovery mechanism for use with a Web appliance or system in which the system may discover the characteristics of the various display components therein and then *re-format Web content* accordingly to enhance the ‘look and feel’ of such content for the discovered characteristics.” (Page 5, lines 7-11; emphasis added.) Beranek further describes, “[t]he method preferably uses the client side HTTP caching proxy *to intercept the Web document* and

then dynamically rewrites the document before it is displayed on the browser associated with the Web appliance.” (Page 6, lines 8-11; emphasis added.) Thus, Applicant asserts that Beranek discloses a method of intercepting an HTTP web document, and then altering its format to conform to the display capabilities of a client device or Web appliance. In other words, Beranek adapts an HTTP web document that is *already configured to be displayed on a browser* to fit the specific format requirements of a client display.

In contrast, claim 1 recites, in part, “a device information providing unit which acquires the *device internal information* of the one or more information devices, generates display data containing the device internal information...and displays the generated display data through the information browsing unit.” (Emphasis added.) Claim 1 also recites that the generated display data has a structure equivalent to the prescribed structure of the layout data generated by the information browsing unit. Note also that the display data, which is displayed, contains the device internal information. Thus, the device internal information is displayed. Independent claims 10 and 19 recite similar limitations.

Applicant asserts that Beranek does not disclose acquiring and displaying the device internal information of the one or more information devices. As noted above, Beranek discloses adapting an HTTP web document that is already configured to be displayed on a browser to fit the specific format requirements of a client display. Thus, there is no need in Beranek to obtain or display device internal information of information devices as recited in independent claims 1, 10 and 19. Instead, in Beranek the HTTP web document is re-formatted to enhance “look and feel.”

Because Beranek does not teach every element of claims 1, 10 and 19, Applicant asserts that these claims are allowable over Beranek. Applicant also asserts that dependent claims 2-9 and 11-19 are allowable over Beranek for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claims. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102(b) rejection of claims 1-19 be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 448252001600. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: March 2, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /Peter J. Yim/

Peter J. Yim

Registration No.: 44,417

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

425 Market Street

San Francisco, California 94105-2482

(415) 268-6373